

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated September 12, 2007 (hereafter, "the official action"). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our deposit account in the amount of the requisite fee.

Claims 57-86 are pending, but claims 74, 76, and 78-86 have been withdrawn. Claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0079512 to Yamazaki *et al.* ("Yamakazi"). Claims 59 and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Yamakazi in view of WO 99/49525 to Petritsch *et al.* ("Petrisch").

By the foregoing, claim 57 has been amended. Support may be found, for example, in Figures 4a-4g.

The various bases for the claim rejections are addressed below in the order presented in the action. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, and 77 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Yamazaki. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 57 recites a combined information display and information input device comprising a matrix of independently addressable light emitting devices and a plurality of light sensing devices, said light emitting devices comprising organic light emitting diodes comprising organic light emitting material positioned between a low work function electrode and a high work function electrode and said light sensing devices comprise organic photovoltaic devices comprising at least an organic electron donor and at least an organic electron acceptor positioned between a high work function electrode and a low work function electrode, wherein the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are disposed on a common substrate. In contrast, the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are provided in separate layers in Yamakazi. This can be seen, for example, in Figure 4 of Yamakazi

in which photodiode 421 is formed in one layer and EL element 422 is formed in a layer disposed over the layer comprising the photodiode 421.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation rejections of claims 57, 58, 60, 62-73, 75, and 77 over Yamakazi have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 59 and 61 have been rejected as obvious over Yamakazi in view of Petritsch. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

All considered claims 57-73, 75, and 77 recite, *inter alia*, a combined information display and information input device comprising a matrix of independently addressable light emitting devices and a plurality of light sensing devices, wherein the light emitting devices and the light sensing devices are disposed on a common substrate.

As described in the second full paragraph on page 1 of the present application, displays which require overlying layers for emission and sensing have the disadvantage that the introduction of further layers in addition to those of the display itself adds to the complexity of the display. Additional layers also increase the thickness of the display and thereby increase light absorption within the display. These very same problems occur in the arrangement disclosed in Yamakazi.

In contrast to Yamakazi, the claimed invention provides a combined information display and information input device which allows different devices for sensing and for emitting to be disposed *on a common substrate*. In certain embodiments of the claimed invention, it is possible to provide good emitting devices and good sensing devices while retaining some common layers there between. For example, Figures 4a to 4g of the present application, illustrate an embodiment wherein anode layer 402, cathode layer 408, and hole transport layer 405 are shared by both the sensing and emitting devices. Although the sensing and emitting devices may use a different hole transport material (as illustrated in Figure 5c(ii)) or a different electrode layer(s), for example, it is often not necessary to change all the layers of the different devices. As such, it is advantageous to provide the two different sensing and emitting devices on a common substrate surface even when

certain different layers are used for the sensing/emitting devices because if certain layers can be made of the same material while still obtaining good sensing/emitting functionality then these common layers can advantageously be deposited in a single deposition step.

In contrast, the sensing and emitting devices in Yamakazi are disposed on different layers and manufactured in separate and distinct processes. Accordingly, the claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by Yamakazi.

Petritsch was merely cited for its disclosure of organic electron donors and organic electron acceptors and thus adds nothing further to the above analysis.

In view of the above, the applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established, and the rejections of claims 59 and 61 as obvious over Yamakazi in view of Petritsch should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP



Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300

December 14, 2007